



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/572,766	03/21/2006	Peter Ward	1-17284	3333
1678	7590	06/09/2009		
MARSHALL & MELHORN, LLC FOUR SEAGATE - EIGHTH FLOOR TOLEDO, OH 43604			EXAMINER	
			NGUYEN, CHI Q	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			3635	
MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE			
06/09/2009	PAPER			

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/572,766	Applicant(s) WARD ET AL.
	Examiner CHI Q. NGUYEN	Art Unit 3635

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 03 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
 - If no period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
 - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 08 April 2009.
- 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 21-39 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 21-25 and 28-39 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) 26 and 27 is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on 21 March 2006 is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/06)
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application
 6) Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

This Office action is in response to applicant's amendment filed on 4/8/2009.

Status of Claims

Claims 21-39 are pending.

Claims 1-20 have been cancelled.

Drawings

The drawings are objected to under 37 CFR 1.83(a) because they fail to show the bore as described in the specification. Any structural detail that is essential for a proper understanding of the disclosed invention should be shown in the drawing. MPEP § 608.02(d). Corrected drawing sheets in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121(d) are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. Any amended replacement drawing sheet should include all of the figures appearing on the immediate prior version of the sheet, even if only one figure is being amended. The figure or figure number of an amended drawing should not be labeled as "amended." If a drawing figure is to be canceled, the appropriate figure must be removed from the replacement sheet, and where necessary, the remaining figures must be renumbered and appropriate changes made to the brief description of the several views of the drawings for consistency. Additional replacement sheets may be necessary to show the renumbering of the remaining figures. Each drawing sheet submitted after the filing date of an application must be labeled in the top margin as either "Replacement Sheet" or "New Sheet" pursuant to 37 CFR 1.121(d). If the changes are not accepted by the examiner,

the applicant will be notified and informed of any required corrective action in the next Office action. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

Specification

The disclosure is objected to because of the following informalities: on page 2, line 2, a phrase "characterised" should read --characterized--; line 6, a phrase "practised" should read --practiced--; line 14, a phrase "practising" should read --practicing--.

Appropriate correction is required.

The specification is objected to as failing to provide proper antecedent basis for the claimed subject matter. See 37 CFR 1.75(d)(1) and MPEP § 608.01(o). Correction of the following is required: "the bore" on page 6, line 15.

A specification in proper idiomatic English and in compliance with 37 CFR 1.52(a) and (b) is required. The substitute specification filed must be accompanied by a statement that it contains no new matter.

The specification has not been checked to the extent necessary to determine the presence of all possible minor errors. Applicant's cooperation is requested in correcting any errors of which applicant may become aware in the specification.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claims 21-30 and 34-35 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

In regarding claim 21, a citation "a first glass ply having an inner face, a second glass ply having an inner face" is confusing because it's unclear that an inner face cited in a first and a second glass plies are the same inner faces? Clarification is required.

Claims 22-30 depending upon the rejected claim 21 are also rejected.

Claim 34 recites the limitation "the production" in line 2. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

Claim 35 recites the limitation "the setting...the area" in lines 2-3. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claims 21-25 and 28-39 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by US Pat. No. 6,138,434 to Demars et al.

Claims 21, 31, 36, 39:

Demars et al. disclose in Fig. 2, a laminated panel comprising a first glass ply 4 having an inner face, a second glass ply 5 having an inner face and a bonding interlayer 8 said laminate having at least one bore 9 extending through the panel wherein a sealing

member 10 is placed between the glass plies 4/5 so as to surround the bore 9 and form a seal with the inner faces of the glass plies thereby excluding the interlayer from an area surrounding the bore and a load bearing insert 15 is positioned in the area surrounding the bore from interlayer has been excluded (see Figs. 2a-2c).

Claims 22 and 24:

Wherein the sealing member 10 is a resilient material, in a disc shaped, comprises a compressible material.

Claims 23 and 25:

Wherein the sealing member 10 is inherently removed from the laminated panel following the completion of the lamination process.

Claim 28:

Wherein the sealing member 10 comprises a ring of compressible material which extends around the perimeter of an annulus formed from a load bearing material and which is positioned prior to the lamination step (col. 4, line 61).

Claim 29:

Wherein thickness of the sealing member, prior to lamination, is inherently greater than that of the annulus.

Claim 30:

Wherein the ring of compressible material is compressed so that its thickness is substantially the same as that of the disc during the lamination process (see Fig. 2).

Claim 32:

Further comprising a sealing member 10 positioned so as to surround the bore.

Claim 33:

Wherein said seal 10 is formed by a ring of compressible material positioned so as to surround the bore (see Fig. 2).

Claim 34:

Wherein said insert 15 comprises a load bearing disc which was positioned prior to the production of the laminate.

Claim 35:

It should be noted that claim 35 is considered product-by-process claims; therefore, determination of patentability is base on the product itself. See MPEP 2113. The patentability of the product does not depend on its method of production. If the product-by-process claim is the same as or obvious from a product of the same prior art, the claim is unpatentable even though the prior product was made by a different process. In re Thorpe, 777 Fed 695, 698, 227 USPQ 964, 966 (Fed.Cir.1985)

Claim 37:

Comprising at least two laminated panels 4/5 lying in the same plane and jointed to one another by means 12 of fixing assemblies which pass through a bore in each panel (Figs. 2a-2c).

Claim 38:

Wherein the fixing 12 assemblies comprise a bolt 13 passing through a bore and acting on a plate which bridges the two panels 4/5.

Allowable Subject Matter

Claims 26-27 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 21-25 and 28-39 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communication from the examiner should be directed to Chi Q. Nguyen whose telephone number is (571) 272-6847. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday from 7:30 am-4:00 pm.

If attempt to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Richard Chilcot can be reached at (571) 272-6777.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pairdirect.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at (866) 217-9197.

/C. Q. N./
Examiner, Art Unit 3635

/Richard E. Chilcot, Jr./
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 3635